



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,210	04/02/2001	Reiner Kraft	ARC920010034US1	2722
67232	7590	04/23/2009		EXAMINER
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP - IBM ARC DIVISION 20 Church Street 22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06103				HILLERY, NATHAN
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/825,210	KRAFT, REINER
	Examiner NATHAN HILLERY	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,5,6 and 8-10 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,5,6 and 8-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 2/13/09.
2. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 – 10 are pending in the case. Claim 1 is independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. The specification defines the target document as a special intermediate document that points directly to a destination document (p 7, lines 10 and 11). If there is only one intermediate document, then that intermediate document must be the target document. Therefore, if the target document no longer exists, then the claimed invention breaks and is essentially rendered inoperable. The specification defines the destination document as a final document or web page which is comprised of a target document that is bundled with contextual data about the source document (p 6, lines 10 and 11). Thus, if the target document no longer exists, then the destination document no longer exists. Consequently, the claimed method has no utility. In short, the metes and bounds of these claims are unclear in at least some cases if not all.

6. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See

MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the nexus between the target document, the source document, the intermediate document(s), and destination document. Essentially it is unclear how these documents relate to each other especially since the intermediate document(s) are claimed passively in the method claim and begs the question as to whether or not they exist and when they actually do exist.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan (US 6665659 B1) [as cited by Applicant] and further in view of Heninger et al. (US 6470349 B1).

Regarding independent claim 1,

Logan teaches that at the request of the user, a sort and extract unit processes the citations in the local store to create a filtered, sort set of citations which are passed to a page retriever. The page retriever generates presents the information contained in or cited by these citations to the user at, either by displaying metadata contained in the citation or by using the URL in the citation to fetch data from the original resource described by that citation, or both (Column 1, lines 27 – 59), which meet the limitation of

defining contextual metadata of the source document, wherein the contextual metadata includes a location of the source document;

Logan teaches that the information distribution system employs an analysis facility which extracts identification and content information from data retrieved via the Internet (Column 1, lines 27 – 59), which meet the limitation of **identifying a target document by a content and contextual data; and**

Logan teaches that the data which is retrieved and analyzed in this fashion may take a variety of forms as illustrated by the HTML Web page, the XML document, etc. The analysis facility coupled to an editing station processes the data from such Internet resources and creates a collection of stored descriptive metadata which are here called "citations" in a citation store (Column 1, lines 27 – 59), which meet the limitation of **saving a bundled target document as the destination document.**

Logan teaches that each of the citations comprises the combination of a "URL" which specifies the Internet address of a particular Internet resource and one or more additional metadata elements ("attributes") (Column 2, lines 5 – 20), which meet the limitation of **the destination document being a final document that includes the target document bundled with contextual data about the source document;**

Logan teaches that each of the citations created by the analysis facility comprises the combination of a Universal Resource Location "URL" which specifies the Internet address of a particular Internet resource and one or more of the following additional metadata elements ("attributes"): a "passage identification" which specifies the beginning and ending location of an particular segment of the data identified by the

URL; and data characterizing the information specified by the passage identification and/or the data specified by the URL by its type, subject matter, or other characteristics (Column 2, lines 5 – 20), which meet the limitation of **bundling the target document, and the contextual metadata of the source document as attributes of the target document; wherein bundling the target document comprises merging the contextual metadata of the source document and the contextual data of the target document as attributes of the target document.**

Logan teaches that if a passage or "fragment" identifier is included in the URI reference then the citation's resource identifier refers only to the sub-component of the containing resource that is identified by the corresponding fragment id internal to that containing resource. When a resource takes the form of an XML document, the URI may designate all or part of the document using an Xpointer (Column 5, lines 41 - 54), which meet the limitation of **wherein defining the contextual metadata of the source document further includes defining a navigation path from the source document to the target document, to enable a client to return to the source document from the target document, in the event that one or more intermediate documents along the navigation path between the source document and the destination document no longer exist.**

Logan does not explicitly teach **automatically synchronizing the destination document to the target document.**

However, Heninger et al. do teach that in the case of caches, it is also useful to generate a source command to be placed in your target script referring back to the

source script. This ensures that the target stays synchronized with the source (Column 16, lines 16 – 20), which meet the limitation of **automatically synchronizing the destination document to the target document.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Logan with that of Heninger et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Logan with a server side scripting language and programming tool designed to simplify programming for web pages using databases or other dynamic information (Column 2, lines 49 – 52).

Regarding dependent claims 5 & 6, Logan teaches that if a passage or "fragment" identifier is included in the URI reference then the citation's resource identifier refers only to the sub-component of the containing resource that is identified by the corresponding fragment id internal to that containing resource. When a resource takes the form of an XML document, the URI may designate all or part of the document using an Xpointer expressed in accordance with the language specifications set forth in XML Pointer Language (Xpointer) See <http://www.w3.org/TR/xpath> (Column 5, lines 41 - 54), which meet the limitations of **defining the contextual metadata of the source document includes defining the address of the source document, and defining the address of the source document includes identifying a URL of the source document.**

Regarding dependent claim 10, Logan teaches that the citation set extractor returns a subset only of the collected citations in database via the Internet to the citation retriever which stores the subset of citations in a local store (Column 3, lines 27 – 32), which meet the limitation of **saving the bundled target document includes saving the destination document on a networked data repository**.

9. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan (US 6665659 B1) and further in view of Heninger et al. (US 6470349 B1) as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Lumsden (US 6006217 A).

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 9, Logan and Heninger et al. do not explicitly teach **defining the contextual metadata of the source document further includes defining input parameters required to generate the target document and defining the input parameters includes defining an input search query**.

However, Lumsden teaches that the user fills out the form, specifying the user's search parameters or criteria, which are often in the form of keywords. The user's search parameters or criteria are intended to define a subset of documents from the Internet. The desired documents may be on any database associated with any of the sites linked together by the Internet (Column 5, line 61 – Column 6, line 3), which meet the limitation of **defining the contextual metadata of the source document further includes defining input parameters required to generate the target document and defining the input parameters includes defining an input search query**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Logan and Heninger et al. with that of Lumsden because such a combination would provide the users of Logan and Heninger et al. with a *software implemented process associated with a server employed to provide search information in response to a request from a user at a client for documents available on the Internet matching search criteria* (Column 2, lines 50 – 54).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
11. Appellant argues that Logan does not teach that **in the event that one or more intermediate documents along the navigation path between the source document and the destination document no longer exist** because all Logan teaches is that in the string of documents there may be additional information pointing to a portion of one of the documents but it is silent as to what happens if one of the documents in the string is deleted (p 4).

The Office disagrees.

First, it is unclear whether or not an intermediate document actually exists. Therefore, the existence or lack of existence of this 'intermediate' document does not affect the scope of the claim in any way; that is to say, the intermediate document in effect has no patentable weight. Simply, it can not be determined when this or these intermediate document(s) actually existed if at all. The intermediate document appears to exist outside of the scope of the claims.

Second, the specification defines the target document as a special intermediate document that points directly to a destination document (p 7, lines 10 and 11). If there is only one intermediate document, then that intermediate document must be the target document. Therefore, if the target document no longer exists, then the claimed invention breaks and is rendered inoperable.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NATHAN HILLERY whose telephone number is (571)272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NH

/DOUG HUTTON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2176